

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3 and 10 have been amended. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶ 2, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Office asserts that claims 3 and 10 recite the limitation “based on a rule defined the in the database” and the limitation as phrased is vague and indefinite for being unclear as to what is being claimed. Applicants have amended claims 3 and 10 by deleting “the” after “defined.” Applicants respectfully contend that the claims, as amended, are no longer vague and indefinite for being unclear as to what is being claimed and no new matter has been added with the amendment. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Gryglewicz (US Patent No 6,993,502). Applicants submit that the claimed subject matter is allowable for the reasons that follow.

With respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 15, Applicants respectfully assert that Gryglewicz does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claims. For example, Gryglewicz does not disclose, *inter alia*, “an interface for receiving tax calculation requests in Appl. No. 10/654,665
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2007

an industry standard format; [and] a plurality of tax calculators, wherein each tax calculator includes an interface for receiving calculator-specific requests in a non-industry standard format,” as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 8 and 15. Gryglewicz does not provide two separate interfaces that are both able to receive tax requests and each interface receives the tax requests in a particular format. The Office points to Figures 7-9 and Column 15, lines 1-55, of Gryglewicz as disclosing “receiving a tax calculation request in an industry standard format at a tax engine.” However, this paragraph in Gryglewicz only provides that the “request for tax calculation on the transaction is received from merchant node by the tax gateway.” See Col. 15, line 10-11. The remainder of the paragraph refers to the contents of the request, the steps available to validate the information within the request, and the merchant’s ability to input business rules into the tax gateway. There is no reference in this paragraph that indicates another component is able to receive the tax calculation request or that the requests may be in a particular format. The only component configured to receive the tax request in Gryglewicz is the tax gateway.

Further, Gryglewicz does not disclose “a translator for translating the tax calculation requests from the industry standard format to a format required for one of the plurality of tax calculators,” as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 8 and 15. The Office points to Column 26, line 48-Column 27, line 17 and Column 37, lines 25-36 of Gryglewicz as providing this translator. However, the translator provided in Gryglewicz performs a “translation of the tax code for the tax authority” so that any tax criteria imposed by a tax authority can be computed. See Col. 37, lines 33-36. Applicants assert that the translator in Gryglewicz does not translate the tax calculation request from the business application.

Appl. No. 10/654,665

Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2007

In light of the above-stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to independent claim 1, 8, and 15 as allegedly being anticipated by Gryglewicz. With respect to dependent claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-10, 12-14, and 16-18, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependent claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 4, 11, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gryglewicz in view of Sullivan (US Publication No. 2003/0055754 A1). Applicants respectfully reassert arguments previously made in reference to independent claims 1, 8, and 15 that Gryglewicz does not disclose each and every feature of these claims. To this extent, Applicants maintain that these claims are patentable over Gryglewicz in view of Sullivan. Accordingly, since claims 4, 11, and 19 depend from claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, Applicants request that the Office withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, he is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael F. Hoffman/

Michael F. Hoffman
Reg. No.: 40,019
(EC)

Date: January 11, 2008

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Telephone (518) 449-0044
Facsimile (518) 449-0047